



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,751	05/26/2004	Fonda J. Daniels	014682.000007	3750
44870	7590	05/28/2008	EXAMINER	
MOORE & VAN ALLEN, PLLC For IBM			SANDERS, AARON J	
P.O. Box 13706				
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2168	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/28/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/709,751	DANIELS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	AARON SANDERS	2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-7,9,11-16,18 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,4-7,9,11-16,18 and 20-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION*****Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10 March 2008 has been entered.

***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's amendment to the claims filed 17 January 2008 has been entered. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 11-16, 18, and 20-22 are pending. Claims 1, 14-15, and 21 are currently amended. Claims 2-3, 8, 10, 17, 19, and 23-45 are cancelled.

***Claim Objections***

As per claim 1, the phrase “the content object including” is incorrect. It appears that it should be “the content object includes.” Further, the phrase “the object content” is incorrect. It appears that it should be “the content object.”

As per claims 5-7, 11-13, 16, 18 and 22, “previously amended” is an improper status identifier. The proper status identifier is “previously presented.” See 37 C.F.R. 1.121(c).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-7, 9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer et al., U.S. 2003/0088520 (Bohrer), in view of Kohane et al., U.S. 2004/0199765 (Kohane).

1. Bohrer teaches “A method for managing privacy preferences or access to restricted information, comprising,” see [0001], “methods, systems and business methods to enforce privacy preferences on exchanges of personal data across a network.”

Bohrer teaches “tagging restricted or personal information in a content object to distinguish the restricted or personal information from an unrestricted portion of the object content,” see Fig. 2 and [0045], “The Authorization Dataset in a rule contains the data items that can be released according to the rule. Each authorization data set can be either a View Level 205... Moreover, a data subject can categorize his/her personal data into multiple View Levels (layers) so that the data in each View Level have the same privacy preference, access and authorization constraints, whereas data in different View Levels have different constraints” where the claimed “content object” is the referenced “authorization rule 201” and the claimed “tagging restricted or personal information” is the referenced user categorization of personal data into “View Levels.”

Bohrer teaches “and distributing the content object based on the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences,” see Fig. 4b and [0081], “A data response

is... the subset of specific data items which were requested and authorized, along with associated privacy declarations representing the data subject's privacy preferences."

Bohrer does not teach "defining the content object to include the unrestricted portion of the object content in a mark-up language and a link to the restricted or personal information, wherein the content object comprises one of a white paper, a case study, a press release, and an article by an author, wherein the unrestricted portion of the content object including a title, an abstract, and a description, and wherein the restricted information comprises personal identification information of the information." Kohane does, however, see [0103], "For example, the record owner can place personal identification information within one record object, and the medical information within another record object. Then the record owner can give agents falling within the 'other' role a privilege to read the record object having the medical information, but grant no privileges to the record object with the personal identification information" and [0038], "In one embodiment, the complete record is represented using an XML directory tree," where the claimed "content object" is the referenced "record," the claimed "unrestricted portion" is the referenced "privilege to read" and the claimed "restricted information" is the referenced "no privileges to the record object." While Kohane does not explicitly teach that the record "comprises one of a white paper, a case study, a press release, and an article," it would be obvious for the record to contain at least a white paper since they are generally confidential, see [0037], "In other embodiments, the record can include other types of personal or confidential information, such as financial data, legal data, etc." Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because Kohane's

teachings would have allowed Bohrer's method to give a third party access to the record without revealing the identity of the author, see [0102].

Bohrer does not explicitly teach "parsing the content object to provide access to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences in response to the content object being collected to satisfy a request." Kohane does, however, see [0103], "Consequently, when the research institution accesses the record of the record owner, the gateway server system 22 parses through the associated directory file and skips over those record objects for which the research institution is unauthorized" and [0083], "The gateway server system 22 parses (step 104) through the directory file to determine those record objects that the accessing agent can manipulate according to the specified record operation." Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because Kohane's teachings would have allowed Bohrer's method to give a third party access to the record without revealing the identity of the author, see [0102].

4. Bohrer teaches "The method of claim 1, further comprising: storing the content object," see [0017], "it allows a data subject to express complex policies on a large set of personal data in a way that is applicable regardless of the specific representation and data model used by enterprises that store that data."

Bohrer teaches "and providing access to the content object," see [0017], "it allows a data subject to specify complex privacy preferences that include who can access the data."

5. Bohrer teaches "The method of claim 1, further comprising: storing the restricted or personal information in a different location from the content object," see Fig.

1 and [0033], “To facilitate the requests from a Data Subject to setup data profiles and privacy policies... The profiles are stored in a Profile Database 123 while the policies are stored in a Policy Database 124.”

Bohrer teaches “and providing access to the restricted or personal information via the link, wherein the link comprises a secure connection,” see Fig. 1 and [0032], “Similarly, a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs 107 to send requests for data 109 as well as receive replies 110 to that request along with any returned data.”

6. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving the request for information,” see [0032], “a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs 107 to send requests for data.”

Bohrer teaches “interrogating content sources,” see [0035], “The Profile Responder 116 receives requests for profile information... and uses the Policy authorization engine to check the authorization and privacy policies.”

Bohrer teaches “and collecting any content objects responsive to the request from the content sources,” see [0016], “The data is released only if the privacy declaration of the requester matches the constraints imposed by the data subject via its privacy preferences.”

7. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 6, wherein collecting any content objects responsive to the request comprises using a collection function,” see Fig. 5 and [0082], “When the entire request list has been processed, the data to be returned is gathered 516, the response structure is constructed and returned to the requester by the Profile Responder 517.”

9. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 6, further comprising distributing any content object responsive to the request to a privacy function,” see [0030], “This embodiment supports the enforcement of privacy preferences in data exchanges according to authorization checks based on the privacy preferences specified by a data subject with the privacy policies of a data requester” where the referenced “authorization checks” are the claimed “privacy functions.”

11. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 1, further comprising locating or accessing privacy preferences or other restriction preferences using another link,” see Fig. 1 and [0032], “Similarly, a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs 107 to send requests for data 109 as well as receive replies 110 to that request along with any returned data.”

12. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim of claim 9, further comprising comparing the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object to a content provider’s policies,” see [0003], “In some cases the web site’s privacy policy is compared to the consumer’s policy preferences and warnings are issued when there is a mismatch.”

13. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 12, further comprising distributing the content object to a requester without any modification to the content object in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object being consistent with the content provider’s policies,” see [0017], “an independent third party acting as a data-subject’s personal data service and providing various services including... matching privacy policies, gathering data from third parties and releasing and/or authorizing release of data to data requesters.”

14. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 12, further comprising: deleting or replacing the restricted or personal information with default or generic information in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object being inconsistent with the content provider’s policies,” see [0081], “A data response is either a denial, if the request cannot be fulfilled, or the subset of specific data items which were requested and authorized” and Fig. 5 where, see [0082], “If the result is deny, then the data item is not included in the list of data items to be returned in the response 511” where the claimed “deleting” is the referenced data “not included” in the response.

Bohrer teaches “repackaging the content object in response to deleting or replacing the restricted or personal information,” see Fig. 5 and [0082], “When the entire request list has been processed, the data to be returned is gathered 516.”

Bohrer teaches “and distributing the repacked content object to a requester without the restricted or personal information which has been deleted or replaced by the default or generic information,” see Fig. 5 and [0082], “the response structure is constructed and returned to the requester by the Profile Responder 517.”

Claims 15-16, 18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer et al., U.S. 2003/0088520 (Bohrer), in view of Fahlman et al., U.S. 5,960,080 (Fahlman).

15. Bohrer teaches “A method for managing privacy or access to restricted information, comprising,” see [0001], “methods, systems and business methods to enforce privacy preferences on exchanges of personal data across a network.”

Bohrer teaches “collecting a content object responsive to a request,” see Fig. 5 and [0082], “If authentication succeeds, then the data request is passed to the Policy Authorization Engine which retrieves all Authorization Rules of the data subject specified in the request 503.”

Bohrer teaches “accessing privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of an author or owner of the content object,” see Fig. 5 and [0082], “the Policy Authorization Engine next compares the privacy declarations in the request with the Privacy Preference Rules in the authorization rules for each profile data item name in the request item 506.”

Bohrer teaches “comparing the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object to the content provider’s policies,” see Fig. 5 and [0082], “For each data item name in the query and in the request item list, the Policy Authorization Engine retrieves any privacy preferences from the authorization rules. It then performs the Policy-Preference matching process (see FIG. 6) for each data item” and [0005], “the products listed here focus on allowing a complex privacy policy to be represented and checked against either a web site’s privacy policy or a data requester’s privacy policy” where the claimed “content provider” is the referenced “web site’s privacy policy or a data requester’s privacy policy.”

Bohrer teaches “repackaging the content object in response to replacing the private or restricted information,” see Fig. 5 and [0082], “When the entire request list has been processed, the data to be returned is gathered 516.”

Bohrer teaches “and distributing the repackaged content object to a requester without the private or restricted information,” see Fig. 5 and [0082], “the response structure is constructed and returned to the requester by the Profile Responder 517.”

Bohrer teaches “[deleting] private or restricted information... in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences being inconsistent with the content provider’s policies, wherein the content provider collects the content object and has access to the private or restricted information,” see Figs. 4-5, 7, [0081], “A data response is either a denial, if the request cannot be fulfilled, or the subset of specific data items which were requested and authorized,” [0082], “If the result is deny, then the data item is not included in the list of data items to be returned in the response 511” and [0088], “FIG. 7 is a flow diagram of a routine that enables a gather and filtering process carried out to collect data to be returned to a data requester,” where the claimed “deleting” is the referenced data “not included” in the response.

Bohrer does not teach “replacing private or restricted information with default or generic information.” Fahlman does, however, see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 48-53, “In step 105, the identified sensitive terms are replaced with standard tokens. For example, the sensitive term ‘Mr. Johnson’ is replaced by the standard token <person-1>, and the term ‘Jul. 1, 1997’ is replaced by <date-1>.” Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because Fahlman’s teachings would have allowed Bohrer’s method to grant access to an untrusted source without compromising confidentiality, see col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 3.

16. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 15, further comprising distributing the content object as originally constituted in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences being consistent with the content provider’s policies,” see [0033], “To facilitate the requests... for data from Data Requesters, the system must provide several different functionalities, including the ability to... authorize release of data based on authorization rules and privacy policy matching and release data.”

18. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 15, further comprising using a collection function to collect the content object responsive to the request,” see Fig. 5 and [0082], “When the entire request list has been processed, the data to be returned is gathered 516, the response structure is constructed and returned to the requester by the Profile Responder 517.”

20. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 15, further comprising distributing any content object in response to the request to a privacy function,” see [0030], “This embodiment supports the enforcement of privacy preferences in data exchanges according to authorization checks based on the privacy preferences specified by a data subject with the privacy policies of a data requester’ where the ‘authorization checks’ are considered ‘privacy functions.’”

21. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 20, further comprising parsing the content object to provide access to privacy preferences or other restriction preferences,” see [0044], “In other words, an Authorization Rule declares that for a specified Authorization Dataset, the specified Privacy Preference Rule is applied for the specified Access List to determine an Authorization Action” and [0046], “The Access List in a rule declares who can access the specified data set upon Privacy Preference matching” where

in order to apply the referenced “Privacy Preference Rule” to the “Access List,” the “Privacy Preference Rule” must be “parsed.”

22. Bohrer teaches “The method of claim 21, further comprising locating or accessing the privacy preferences or restriction preferences using a link,” see Fig. 1 where, see [0032], “Similarly, a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs 107 to send requests for data 109 as well as receive replies 110 to that request along with any returned data.”

### ***Response to Arguments***

As per Applicant’s argument that Bohrer does not teach “defining the content object to include the unrestricted portion of the object content in a mark-up language and a link to the restricted or personal information, wherein the content object comprises one of a white paper, a case study, a press release, and an article by an author, wherein the unrestricted portion of the content object including a title, an abstract, and a description, and wherein the restricted information comprises personal identification information of the information,” the Examiner agrees. Kohane does, however, see [0103], “For example, the record owner can place personal identification information within one record object, and the medical information within another record object. Then the record owner can give agents falling within the ‘other’ role a privilege to read the record object having the medical information, but grant no privileges to the record object with the personal identification information” and [0038], “In one embodiment, the complete record is represented using an XML directory tree,” where the claimed “content object” is the referenced “record,” the claimed “unrestricted portion” is the referenced “privilege to

read” and the claimed “restricted information” is the referenced “no privileges to the record object.”

While Kohane does not explicitly teach that the record “comprises one of a white paper, a case study, a press release, and an article,” it would be obvious for the record to contain at least a white paper since they are generally confidential, see [0037], “In other embodiments, the record can include other types of personal or confidential information, such as financial data, legal data, etc.” Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because Kohane’s teachings would have allowed Bohrer’s method to give a third party access to the record without revealing the identity of the author, see [0102].

As per Applicant’s argument that Bohrer does not “parsing the content object to provide access to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences in response to the content object being collected to satisfy a request,” the Examiner does not agree, but has withdrawn the rejection. Instead, Kohane teaches the limitation, see [0103], “Consequently, when the research institution accesses the record of the record owner, the gateway server system 22 parses through the associated directory file and skips over those record objects for which the research institution is unauthorized” and [0083], “The gateway server system 22 parses (step 104) through the directory file to determine those record objects that the accessing agent can manipulate according to the specified record operation.” Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because

Kohane's teachings would have allowed Bohrer's method to give a third party access to the record without revealing the identity of the author, see [0102].

As per Applicant's argument that Bohrer does not teach "replacing private or restricted information with default or generic information in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences being inconsistent with the content provider's policies, wherein the content provider collects the content object and has access to the private or restricted information," the Examiner agrees in part. Bohrer teaches "[deleting] private or restricted information... in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences being inconsistent with the content provider's policies, wherein the content provider collects the content object and has access to the private or restricted information," see Figs. 4-5, 7, [0081], "A data response is either a denial, if the request cannot be fulfilled, or the subset of specific data items which were requested and authorized," [0082], "If the result is deny, then the data item is not included in the list of data items to be returned in the response 511" and [0088], "FIG. 7 is a flow diagram of a routine that enables a gather and filtering process carried out to collect data to be returned to a data requester," where the claimed "deleting" is the referenced data "not included" in the response.

Bohrer does not teach "replacing private or restricted information with default or generic information." Fahlman does, however, see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 48-53, "In step 105, the identified sensitive terms are replaced with standard tokens. For example, the sensitive term 'Mr. Johnson' is replaced by the standard token <person-1>, and the term 'Jul. 1, 1997' is replaced by <date-1>." Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of

the cited references because Fahlman's teachings would have allowed Bohrer's method to grant access to an untrusted source without compromising confidentiality, see col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 3.



***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure: U.S. 2002/0091741 and U.S. 2003/0145017.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Sanders whose telephone number is 571-270-1016. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00a-4:00p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tim T. Vo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2168

/Aaron Sanders/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2168  
13 May 2008

/S. P./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164